

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-7899**

---

WILLIE LOVE HAMILTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

PATRICK CONROY; JOSEPH CURRAN,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, Senior District Judge. (CA-02-625-WMN)

---

Submitted: February 4, 2003

Decided: February 14, 2003

---

Before WILKINS and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Willie Love Hamilton, Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Mary Ann Rapp Ince, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Willie Love Hamilton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000). An appeal may not be taken to this court from a final order denying relief under § 2254 unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). When, as here, a district court dismisses a petition solely on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability will not issue unless the petitioner can demonstrate both "(1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.'" Rose v. Lee, 252 F. 3d 676, 684 (4th Cir.) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)), cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 318 (2001). We have reviewed the record and conclude for the reasons stated by the district court that Hamilton has not made the requisite showing. See Hamilton v. Conroy, No. CA-02-625 (D. Md. Nov. 6, 2002). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED